

4-1830

The Christian Examiner: No. 6

Joseph C. Norwood

Jacob Creath Jr

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/sc_arc_journals

Recommended Citation

Norwood, Joseph C. and Creath, Jacob Jr, "The Christian Examiner: No. 6" (1830). *ACU Archives Stone-Campbell Journals*. Paper 5.
http://digitalcommons.acu.edu/sc_arc_journals/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Archival Journals at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ACU Archives Stone-Campbell Journals by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU. For more information, please contact dc@acu.edu.

L. Steele

THE
CHRISTIAN
EXAMINER.

No. 6.

EDITED BY
JOSEPH C. NORWOOD AND JACOB CREATH, JR.

FOR APRIL, 1830.

"Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."—PAUL.

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY,

1830.

tions
ther
given
"C
believe
gress
throu
sins,
salve
it be
tians
der
of h
ple
sion
He
son
Sup
it i
Pa
is c
pa
th
ise
l
F
it
co
s
w
b
v
s
:

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

VOL. 1.

APRIL 26, 1830.

NO. 6.

"Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."—PAUL.

For the Christian Examiner.

ON THE REMISSION OF SINS IN BAPTISM.
REVIEW OF ELDER D's LETTER No. II.

MY DEAR ELDER:

THE subsequent quotation, from the February No. of the Christian Baptist, expresses the writer's views so fully, upon those passages quoted in your letter, to prove that forgiveness is by faith alone, without baptism, that I have concluded to head my essay with it.

"I know you will concur with me in saying that salvation must be received before it can be enjoyed. What then is the action by which it is received? Whatever it may be, it cannot deprive the salvation of the attribute grace. It is *faith*, say you, by which we receive the salvation—Then faith ceases to be a *principle* of action, if it be the action itself. But "*faith works*" and is not itself the *work*. Faith can receive a promise or a truth, and then the *promise* or the *truth* becomes the principle of action. Now if there was a promise that I should be pardoned the moment I believe that promise, then I might have a pardon through faith. But if the promise of pardon is connected with any other action than believing, then it is only when I perform that action that I can be assured of pardon. Pardon is ascribed to the blood of Christ as the worthy cause: but it is connected with, because promised through, certain actions. Suppose a christian, one who has put on Christ, should commit some sin. How is he to be pardoned? By faith simply? No—He must *confess it*, and ask for pardon. Pardon, then, follows confession and prayer. So the Apostle John teaches. Now, when a disciple who sins confesses his fault and obtains forgiveness, does the fact of his confession or his prayer destroy the nature of grace, or render faith of no value? If, then, God has promised pardon to christians for particular sins through confession and prayer, why should it be thought incompatible that he would require "*confession unto salvation*," or baptism as a means of bestowing remission of all past sins, on coming into the kingdom of the Messiah? If he will not through faith without confession forgive a christian a known transgression, why suppose that he would forgive all past sins prior to believing, simply through faith?

"Our Saviour taught his disciples that, when they asked for forgiveness for themselves, if they did not forgive one another, neither would their heavenly father forgive them. If, then, conditions of forgiveness are appended to faith in one case why object to

baptism as a condition of remission in another? And surely if neither our confession, nor our prayer, nor our forgiving those who trespass against us, precludes the idea of grace, nor impairs the value of faith in obtaining remission, baptism can impair neither the one nor the other, when proclaimed for the remission of sins."

In my last essay, I reviewed that part of your letter which treated of creeds. This essay will be devoted to that part which speaks of the remission of sins in baptism. You say, "you do not believe that baptism is necessary to salvation." I did not see one passage quoted to shew that it is unnecessary, and if unnecessary, then useless and nugatory—no wisdom, no benevolence, no fitness in the institution to impart to believers the unspeakable blessing of pardon—no suitability nor adaptation of the means to the end. But it must be received as an abstract precept, or an arbitrary rule, founded upon the will of him who commands; and then, it is even thought to be unnecessary to obey that arbitrary and abstract will, unless it be perfectly convenient. Any thing which is unnecessary, is superfluous, null and void, and hence I have often wondered why the Baptists would spend so much time, labor and expense, and subject themselves to the odium of all the paidobaptist world, simply for an "UNNECESSARY THING." They have surely acted very unwisely and unchristianly in this affair, according to the above reasoning. But the term *unnecessary* is altogether objectionable when applied to this celestial institute. It is a latinized barbarism, coined by Austin in the 4th century, and applied to religious matters. It is derived from the Latin word *necessarius*. This non-necessity involves the dispensing power, from which originated the grand and awful *apostasia*—apostacy. This doctrine divides the Bible into two grand chapters, of essentials and non-essentials, and gives the Clergy the authority of saying what is essential and what is not, who are sure to determine in their own favor, and to God's injury. Faith is not more intimately connected with immersion, than immersion is with salvation, in these words, He that believeth and is immersed shall be saved. Christ has joined these links together, who will sever them? He says that he who has faith and immersion shall have salvation—who will say that he shall be saved with either faith or immersion. Will he oppose his "bare word," to Christ's authority and say one half will do? God has joined these three together, let him that separates them answer for it. It is often said that the thief was saved without baptism. So was Abel, Abraham and Isaac. But they and the thief were saved before christian baptism was instituted. Where did the Apostles ever tell a man he could be saved without it, that it was unnecessary? No where. The third of John is referred to, God so loved the world, &c. But surely Christ did not lay such great stress upon baptism in his discourse with Nicodemus in the 5th verse, and then preach a different doctrine in the same chapter? John Wickliffe, the Baptist reformer of the fourteenth century, founded his belief of the necessity of baptism in order to salvation upon these words, Except a man be born of water and spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. [See Gilpin's Life of Wickliffe, page 60.] Upon this

* A
affirm
presse
have
led d
he ad
tract
sins
Bap
stiti
whi
be b
to s
Wi
tha
wa
tha
En
sic
ti
ne
in
m
a
t

verse, the Greek and Latin fathers, (such as Austin, Jerome, Chrysostom and Cyril) built the necessity of infant immersion, in order to salvation: they said, no immersion no salvation. The 10th of Romans is quoted, If thou shalt confess with thy mouth, &c. to make Paul contradict himself in the sixth chapter, where he proves that believers are buried with Christ in baptism. Why should it be thought incredible by the modern old Baptists and the sects, that God should remit sins in baptism? They either do not read their creeds, or else they do not believe them. The Baptist London Confession, published first in 1642, then republished in 1646, then in 1688, has these words: "Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being ingrafted into him; OF REMISSION OF SINS." Referring to Acts 26, 18; that the Gentiles should receive remission of sins in baptism.

For the modern Baptists to call themselves old fashioned Baptists, and yet deny remission of sins in Baptism, either argues great ignorance, or great obstinacy, or both. Not many of them know what the old Baptists did believe. Let the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists look at the article "baptism" in their creeds, and see if it is not as strong or stronger than any writing, except the inspired writings. And there is this difference between them and us, they apply it to sleeping babes, we to believers. All the most celebrated and earliest Fathers preached the remission of sins in baptism.

That the sins of *believers* are remitted in the act of baptism was never denied, until gross darkness had covered the earth, and until the modern sects sprung up. The following extract from ecclesiastical history, will shew what were the views of the Lollards or English Baptists in the fourteenth century, which was before the dawn of the Reformation. They were so numerous in England at that time, as to threaten the downfall of the Papal throne. "It was said that if you met two men on the road, you might be sure that one was a Wickliffeite or Lollard." The biographer of John Wickliffe says: "With regard to baptism, he thought it necessary to salvation. This he grounded on the expression, '*Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God,*' which he understood of material water. But he opposed the superstition of three immersions." [Page 60, Gilpin's Life of Wickliffe.] Baptism was thought *necessary* to salvation and to the remission of sins by the Baptists in the 14th century. See the following extract from Neal's History of the Puritans; (vol. 1, page 51.) "To Mr. Neal's account of Wickliffe's sentiments it may be added, that he advanced some tenets which did not only symbolize with, but led directly to, the peculiar opinions of those who, called Baptists, have in subsequent ages formed a large body of dissenters, viz. 'That wise men leave that as impertinent, which is not plainly expressed in Scripture; that those are fools and presumptuous which affirm such infants not to be saved, which die without baptism;'"

* A proof that infants were immersed in *that age* for the remis-

that baptism doth not confer, but only signify grace, which was given before. He also denied, that ALL sins are abolished by baptism;* and asserted that children may be saved without baptism." Notwithstanding all this, his enemies represented him as denying the use of 'material water' altogether.

Mr John Wesley, the father of the Methodists, says in his notes on Acts 22, 16, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." "Baptism, says he, administered to REAL penitents, is both a means and a seal of pardon. Nor did God ORDINARILY in the primitive Church bestow this (pardon) on any, unless through this means, (baptism)." The next verse is Acts 10, 43, "To him give all the Prophets witness, that whosoever (whether Jew or Gentile) believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." These are Peter's words and doctrine. He uses the same word (*aphesis*) Acts 2, 38, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, (*eis aphesisin peri amartias*,) for the remission of sins." And a similar expression, Acts 3, 19, "Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out," &c. Now surely Peter did not preach one doctrine to the three thousand and another to Cornelius and his friends. He did not teach the 3,000 that their sins were remitted in baptism, and Cornelius that his were remitted without it, unless like the modern "Ambassadors" he contradicted himself, and carried water on both shoulders. His doctrine was one in both places, the remission of sins in baptism. The same doctrine was taught by both Luke and Paul. Luke 24, 47, "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations," &c. Paul taught in the Synagogue of Pisidia, "That through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins," Acts 13, 38. And before Agrippa, he said, "That they (the Gentiles) may receive the forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me." From the verisimilitude of phraseology, and from the inspiration of these men, we are compelled to say, that they preached the same doctrine that Peter did at Jerusalem, the remission of sins in the act of immersion, unless, like all the sectarian "ambassadors," they preached different Gospels. The twelve Ambassadors worked by one rule, therefore there was no confusion among them. They had one church, one Lord, one faith, one baptism for the remission of sins.

Here we are strong Wesleyites instead of Campbellites, and restorationists, pharisees, infidels, heretics, *et cetera*. We wish our Methodist friends to notice these words:—1. Baptism is to real penitents (we baptize no others) both the means or media, and seal of pardon and remission of sins:—2. That in primitive times God did not *ordinarily* bestow this pardon on any unless through immersion.

sion of original sin, which had been taught by St. Augustine, and not for the purpose of bringing them under the care of the Church, as pedobaptists do now affirm.

* Thereby acknowledging, directly, that some sins are abolished by baptism.

Queries: Is there any other means or media through which remission of sins is conveyed to "REAL penitents?" If there be, prove it. The modern sectarians say, that the sins of "REAL penitents" are remitted before baptism. The writer of this essay heard a particular preacher, in the presence of thousands contradict the whole college of Apostles, by telling the people that "they must be baptized, but not for the remission of their sins." This same *dogmatizer*, says John the immerser was not a Prophet, "but was called and sent as we are." Jesus said John was more than a Prophet, Math. 11, 9, Luke 7, 23. He delivered two prophecies, Math. 3, 11, John 1, 29. But R. T. D. says he was not. The college of Apostles say we must be baptized for the remission of our sins, but this ambassador without credentials, says we must *not* be baptized for the remission of our sins. The writer heard another particular preacher ask a candidate for an ambassadorship, if he believed that baptism washed away our sins; or in other words, that our sins are remitted in the act of baptism? He replied, no. Neither of them believed the Apostles told the truth. Query. If God did not *ordinarily* (not extraordinarily) bestow pardon upon any, unless through immersion, in primitive times; does he "ordinarily" bestow pardon on any in modern times, unless through immersion. If so, who are they? Why does he change his means of bestowing pardon? When did he make this change in his media of communication? To whom did he announce this change? To the modern sects? Let them produce the credentials, and we will believe them. As we are sound Wesleyites in this article of our faith, we hope all clamor against us will be stopped from that quarter.

According to Mr. Wesley's doctrine, how many "real penitents," among the modern Methodists, has God "pardoned and sealed?"

In order to shew that we are orthodox Calvinists, and not Campbellites, in this article of our faith, and to shield ourselves from the assaults of all Calvinistic Baptists and Presbyterians, we shall make the following quotations *verbatim et literatim* from the 15th chap. and 4th book of Calvin's Institutes, (vol. 3, page 327, 346.) "Baptism," says he, "resembles a legal instrument properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are canceled, effaced and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all who believe to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore those who have imagined, that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, [this is just the view the old modern Baptists have of it, or rather their's is not quite so good a view as this] have not considered that which was the *PRINCIPAL* thing in baptism: which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Can any thing be stronger than this? Remission of sins, he says, is the *principal* thing promised in baptism. The modern old Baptists, say it is a duty, or abstract rule, or arbitrary precept. Are not time, and means, and persons, all necessary to cancel, efface and obliterate legal records? Would the modern old Baptists, consider that

all their debtors had paid them, when no time could be recollected or definitely specified, no money shown, no witnesses produced, no tangible nor visible records exhibited to establish the fact? Would men either convey or receive property upon as precarious a tenure as this? Do the American people hold their lives, property and liberty, upon an invisible, intangible, mental understanding? Is there not a media through which property is held? through which naturalization or citizenship is enjoyed? Through which natural life is sustained, such as bread, water, air and clothing? Is there not a media through which instruction is conveyed to the infant mind, viz: parents and instructors? Is there not a media through which the human race, the irrational creation or creatures, in heaven, upon the earth and in the seas, are produced, continued and sustained? Is there not a media through which all revolutions, in the natural, moral, and political world, are effected? Yes, in the natural world, regeneration is produced by the sun, the wind, rain and earth. In the moral, by parents and preceptors. In the political, by civilians. But in religion, the modern sects seem to think there is no media, no wisdom nor benevolence displayed, or less than there is in other departments of God's empire. No adaptation in the ministry of reconciliation, the Gospel and its institutions, to produce regeneration in the human heart. Strange neglect. There is a law in all other departments, but in christianity there is none; there is a channel of communication in all his other works, but in christianity they are choked and frozen over with physical, mechanical operations, abstrated from all media, all rule, common sense, all experience and every thing else? The moderns differ from the poet who sung,

"Nature with open volume stands

"To spread her Maker's praise abroad;

"And every labor of his hands

"Shows something worthy of a God, [except christianity]

"Here his whole name appears complete,

"Nor wit can guess, nor reason prove,

"Which of the letters best is writ,

"The power, the wisdom or the love."

But again, Calvin understands the following passages as we do, Mark 16, 16, chap. 5, 26. Titus 3, 5, 1st Peter 3, 21, and all the other passages which teach that baptism is the bath or laver of regeneration. The blood of Christ is the cause of remission of sins, baptism is the means through which this blessing is sensibly conveyed to "real penitents." Augustine says, that in Christ's baptism, our sins are remitted in fact.

It is well known that baptism was universally supposed by all the earliest and best writers and reformers, invariably to accompany the plenary remission of all past sins, which totally changed the state and character of the person, and constituted him a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of Heaven. Hence it was almost constantly denoted by the terms *illumination* and *regeneration*. Justin Martyr, who flourished about the middle of the second century, confounds baptism with *regeneration*. "Whoever,"

says he, "believes the things which are affirmed by us to be true, and promises to live accordingly, are afterwards conducted to a place where there is water, and are regenerated by the same method of regeneration which we have experienced." Here are three things: he believes, he promises to live according to the gospel, and then he is regenerated—(*dia loutrou paliggenesias*, Titus 3--5)—through the washing of regeneration, and then the renewing of the holy spirit. (See Eph. v, 26.) This is our practice—this is the gospel of Paul and all the apostles. We deny the slang, of baptism washing away sins, without faith in the blood of Christ. We deny that baptism will save any person, without faith and gospel obedience. This slang is the strongest argument that our opponents have yet offered here against us. We consider ourselves invulnerable, as it respects them. You say that we may as well make pardon depend upon confession as upon baptism; and you quote this passage, in 1st John, 1st chap., If we confess our sins, he is just and faithful to forgive us our sins. To whom is pardon promised in this passage? Answer: to those who confess their sins? Must not the rule work both ways? Did God ever pardon a sinner who did not confess his sins? who was he? when did God pardon him? how does he know he pardoned him? has he complied with the terms of the proclamation? No. But God has stepped out of the ordinary way to show him favour! When did any human government (that deserves the name) ever pardon a rebel, except according to law and government? An answer to two questions, will go very far to settle this controversy. The first is, at *what* time does our government pardon criminals? When the criminal first hears the report or rumour that the executive has pardoned him? No. When he first believes the report? No. He does not consider himself liberated, until the pardon comes *formally* announced to him with the Governor's signature, and with all the authority and pledges of the government that he is pardoned. Then is the time and here is the media through which he is pardoned. He can see and feel it, and always recollect it as long as he retains his reason; the same of baptism. Although some may call it lamp-black and paper, the "bare word" of the governor in black and white, will make him leap like a roe or young hart. The media is simple, but it is sufficient to convey the blessing to him.

To whom did God promise the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession? To Abraham and his descendants through Isaac and Jacob, and to none else. To whom did he promise pardon, under the Jewish dispensation? To the Jews who brought their offerings *according* to the strict letter of the law, and to none else. It was necessary for a proper person to bring a proper offering, before he could obtain the promised blessings.

To whom has he promised eternal life and pardon, under the gospel? To him that believeth and is baptized, and to none else. As Calvin says, "we are cleansed from our sins by the blood of Christ. What sign and testimony of that ablution is there, except baptism? We answer none. This ablution is referred to baptism. By baptism, (says he,) the faithful are *assured* and *certified*, that a

full and entire remission of both the guilt and punishment of sins is granted," p. 333-4. On Acts, 22, 16, where Ananias told Paul to arise, he says, "that thou mayest be ASSURED that thy sins are forgiven, be baptized. For in baptism the Lord promises remission of sins; receive this and be SECURE." He adds, "God works by or through means." Page 340, he says, "by baptism God promises remission of sins and will certainly fulfil the promise to all believers; that promise was offered to us in baptism; let us therefore embrace it by faith: it was long dormant by reason of unbelief, now then let us receive it by faith."

This is strong Calvinism or orthodoxy; it is not Campbellism. After this essay sees the light, we hope to hear of no more slang nor persecution from old modern Calvinistic Baptists, nor Presbyterians, nor Methodists, of baptism washing away sins; if we do, we shall say, physicians heal yourselves. As to our Episcopalian friends, we refer them to their prayer book, article, baptism of babes. If they believe their prayer book, they are bound to believe that our sins are remitted in the very act of baptism, and not before. "The Augsburg confession, to which all the Lutheran churches are supposed to assent, and which was solemnly presented to Charles the fifth at the Imperial Diet, as the authentic exhibition of their sentiments, expresses itself in the following terms: Concerning baptism, they (the followers of Luther) teach that it is NECESSARY TO SALVATION; that by baptism is offered the grace of God; and that children are to be baptized, who being presented to God in baptism are received into the grace of God. They condemned the Anabaptists who disapproved of the baptism of children, and who affirm that children are SAVED without baptism." See Augsburg confession, article 9. The conclusion of the whole matter is, that baptism for the remission of sins of believers is—first, ancient; secondly, it was universally practiced in the primitive times; thirdly, it is reasonable and philosophical; and fourthly, it is orthodox, if there be any such thing among Catholics, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists and Calvinistic Baptists. But ABOVE ALL, it was the practice of the Apostles and the christians of the primitive and pure ages, to immerse believers for the remission of their sins.

In the mean time, I will remind you that there is no dispute about the necessity of pardon, but it is all about the *when*, and the *how*, as nearly all religious disputes are.

Hoping that you and I, and all christians, may live in the continual enjoyment of so great, so free, and so full a blessing as the pardon of all our sins, through faith in the propitiation of Christ, and immersion into his name, I subscribe myself, yours affectionately.

ARCHIPPUS.

FROM THE BAPTIST CHRONICLE.

To Mr. J. G. Norwood, Editor of the *Christian Examiner*.
 SIR:—In the December number of your paper I have noticed a

piece over the signature of J. H. which I interpret Josephus Hewitt; in which I am represented as having made an agreement with certain Ministers of the Gospel, to appear with them on the third Saturday in Nov. last, for a special purpose, at the Baptist meeting house on South Benson.—I now apprise this young Prophet, that in making the above representation, he proves himself to be a *lying Prophet*, by giving currency to the above falsehood. Has he proof? Let him produce it, or plead guilty. Again he represents that church as having been nursed by Rev. S. M. Noel *more than any other* in Franklin association. This also is a notorious falsehood, and he cannot without the most unblushing effrontery deny it. He further represents a very animated discussion to have taken place in relation to the “sufficiency of the scriptures, in which he *gave them a brisk fire for about one hour.*” I say this statement is partial, and, like the others, false. Who has denied the sufficiency of the Scriptures, for the purposes for which Infinite Wisdom designed them. Will this Cat’s paw contend that they are sufficient for other purposes? Were they ever sufficient, or are they now sufficient to silence Heretics, Scysmatics or Blasphemers? He knows, or ought to know, they are not. But “*he had prepared himself.*” For what? To make a “*brisk fire for about one hour, till day light closed!!!*” Yes to make a ranting, unmeaning declamation (as I learn) against creeds.

Now, I do not say that J. H. has a *creed*, for he that has a creed, has some *views definite and tangible of what the Scriptures teach.* If he has such views I am yet to learn it. I therefore do not say he has a creed; but this I do say, that for a lad of his grade to intrude himself into the council at South Benson, there to question the right of that church to maintain her *own views* of what the scriptures teach, that is her *own creed*, argues a degree of weakness and impudence well calculated to excite the mingled emotions of pity and contempt.

This boasted majority “40 to 33” swells his vanity to bursting.—No Jack Daw ever strutted more fantastically in Peacock quills. He would have the reader believe that those forty members were opposed to a creed; that like himself they had no views, no settled belief of what the scriptures teach; no creed, for such is the theological meaning of the term creed, which he and his associates in faction and schism are ever careful to conceal from the people. Why did he not tell the whole truth, that this church consisted of about 300 members, and that owing to the inclemency of the day, only 73 attended, that of his 40 not ten, perhaps not one stood opposed to a creed; neither their church creed nor the terms of general union? (I have conversed with some of them, who declare they are in favor of a creed.) Such was their known attachment to the union, that our *Prophet* himself took care sedulously to disguise and conceal his views of the terms of union, so that their votes were influenced by other considerations.

At the Dec. church meeting this boasted decision was re-considered and reversed by an overwhelming majority. And at their Jan. meeting the malcontents proposed to continue in the church

under their creed, provided they would make no record of proceedings under the advice of the last Franklin association. This proposition being rejected, they scismatised tumultuously, and have since embodied themselves. What a triumph this for our *little man* of Gath and his companions in faction. What a frightful anomaly do they present in the Religious world; stirring up factions, rending churches, and constituting their followers into no *creed churches!* Yet upon, or within the creed of general union, expressed or understood. Surely, surely, "*The day has dawned and who shall forbid the rising of the Sun?*" Neither Devils nor wicked lying Prophets. No verily, they cannot accomplish it tho' mounted on a *Camel*.

I have more to say to this strutting self conceited weathercock, and Cat's paw, relative to his lawless, piratical conduct, which is reserved until I meet him face to face.

In the mean time I ask of Mr. Norwood to do me the justice to publish this defence in his next paper, that the antidote may accompany the poison, my name having been wantonly, (with others) presented to the public in connection with suggestions, which I pronounce false and slanderous.

I offer no apology to Josephus Hewitt, for removing the veil, under which he concealed himself, and for holding him up to the contempt of all truthful men, and that the finger of scorn, may be pointed at all such intruders.—I will however give him this advice, *Tailor stick to your goose—cease to do evil and learn to do good.*

Frankfort Feb. 10, 1830.

J. DUDLEY.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

At the request of Mr. Dudley, I have inserted his letter, *vebatim et literatim*; much against my inclination, however, for there is so little of the spirit of christianity exhibited in it, and so much of a contrary spirit, that I am inclined to think it will not only injure its author, but contribute much to lower the cause he would advocate, in the estimation of all sensible men. I do not wish to assist any man to destroy himself, neither am I willing to be instrumental in circulating articles calculated to degrade christianity; yet, as the letter he pretends to answer (see p. 44, of the 2nd number) was published in the Examiner, and he appears anxious that "*the antidote may accompany the poison,*" I am constrained to give it a place in our pages. I entertain no hostile feelings towards this gentleman, but only regret that he should have paid so little attention to the *manner* of his letter. It is on this account that I do not publish it with pleasure. In my preface to this work I promised "to publish any temperately written statement, which would in my judgment produce the desired effect of correcting error." I consider that in publishing Mr. D's letter I have much exceeded my proposition, as it is both intemperate and ill calculated to correct falsehood, if, indeed, falsehood is to be found in the note of J. H. But I hope that those who read Mr. D's statement, will attribute it to any other spirit than the spirit of the gospel. The influence of the Holy Spirit produces no such effects.

The letter signed "J. H." was written by Josephus Hewett, not

however with the intention that it should be published. Responsibility for its publication lies on me, and the responsibility for its truth or falsehood rests with him. If he has been guilty of circulating falsehood, it is no mitigation of the crime that it was done privately. But the letter of Mr. D. is very far from convincing me that the charge alleged against J. H. is true; for, with due respect, I would inform him that such terms and slang as "*heretics, schismatics, blasphemers, jack-daw, peacock, mounted on a camel, impudence, weathercock, and lawless piratical conduct,*" &c. &c. do not amount to *proofs* with me, neither do I consider them *strong arguments* against those who are *guilty* of constituting churches on the word of God—the one foundation. Mr. D. charges J. H. with telling three lies. "Has he the proof? Let him produce it," (for surely it is not to be found in the letter above,) and we shall then condemn the conduct of J. H. as much as he or any other man could do. D. has laid in the charge, and then calls on J. H. to prove himself clear. This is truly a novel request, especially from a *senator*, and I would humbly suggest that the burden of proof in this case rests upon him.

I am not personally acquainted with Mr. D., but I am informed that he is the "*senator and law-maker*" alluded to in the following paragraph by ELDER JOHN TAYLOR of Franklin county, which we copy in order that he may be introduced to those of our readers who are in like situation with myself—have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance.

[From Elder Taylor's "*History of Ten Churches,*" p. 192-4.]

"A heavy dispute arose between the pastor and one of the most leading members of the church, [at Frankfort] both of them filling high offices in the state, one of them a senator, a law-maker, the other, auditor of all the revenue of the state. The first rupture it seems between these men, was about politics, that has run so very high in Kentucky; other things soon sprang up which widened the breach between them. The pastor thinking it his duty to treat with his brother according to the law of Christ, either from lack of skill in the pastor, or the violence of his brother in their interview together, they nearly came to blows, not all the labour of their friends could bring them together; Noel with all his pacific measures could not bring them together. Being a member at Frankfort, he strove hard with all the help he could get, but all in vain."

"At length their distresses must come into the Church. It seems the plan fallen on was, each one to prepare his written charges, against the other, and present them at the next meeting. The pastor had three or four against his brother; the other has *thirty-one* exceptions or charges against his pastor, *who must have had his approbation in his first ordination, and also his voice to put him in the pastoral office, in the church.* At this dreadful business, the poor distressed church laboured many days and nights; and twenty-three charges yet behind. They send abroad for helps: and so far as I yet know, things are no better. I only witnessed about ten hours of this violent trial. It overgoes all the calculations I can make, to reconcile it to the religion that comes from the Saviour,

how a disciple of Christ can make a book of several sheets, and deliberately, for several weeks, be setting down charges against a brother, (his pastor) and the chief of them *so frivolous, that wicked ingenuity must be put to the rack to make them out charges*, and then with such angry violence, contend for them for days together. I confess if this is the religion of Christ, I know nothing about it. I wonder while a man is making out so long a list of charges, that it does not occur to him what sort of a being the devil is. *An accuser of the brethren.* After the 31 charges were gone through, an unwritten one seemed more destructive than all the rest, as to the pastor's interest in life: for it was a charge of *insanity*; the other charges were calculated to destroy his peace and comfort as a christian, and his usefulness as a preacher; but this last to destroy his office, from which all the supplies of his family came. This last charge made many of the spectators impatient and sorrowful, but when they heard the replications of their pastor to all those charges, which put to the *blush* this last charge of insanity, their spirits revived again." This is the gentleman who has charged Josephus Hewett with lying. From this first specimen you may judge of the last.

I am sorry, on Mr. D's account, that he published his letter, in the heat of passion, for I am almost sure that a moments cool consideration of it would have convinced him that it did not answer his purpose, and that its only tendency would be to make Christians lament that one professing christianity should display so little of the spirit and temper of his Master. I hope, when he writes again, he will think of this, and let his language be such as the oracles of God require. I shall be open to conviction when he produces *proof* in support of his charges against J. H., but until that is afforded I cannot believe them. And will conclude by simply stating, that his letter is among the many and strong proofs which we have before us, of the necessity of a thorough *reformation*, and, no doubt, it will be so considered by the public generally. J. G. NORWOOD.

P. S. Since writing the above, I received the following *replication* to Mr. Dudley's letter, from Josephus Hewett. We recommend the subjoined certificate to the attention of our readers.—N.

To Mr. U. B. Chambers, editor of the "Baptist Chronicle."

SIR: It must always be painful to the pious mind, to behold a man professing Christianity, carried away from the temper of the gospel into angry abuse; when he is required, by the precepts of the Bible, to restore any who are overtaken in a fault, in the spirit of meekness, and not to reject even a *"heretic"* until after the first and second admonition. An indulgence of this temper, and a total neglect of these precepts, on the part of a writer in the third number of your paper, who signs himself "J. Dudley," and whose avowed object is to prostrate my character, is the cause of this communication to you, which you are requested to publish in the next Chronicle.

In November last, I attended a meeting of the South Benson church. On my return home, I transmitted a note on business to the

editor of the Examiner, in which, in all the looseness of extreme haste and familiar friendship, I stated the principal events of the meeting. That this note was not intended for the public eye, I state as an apology for the *manner*, and the *manner alone*, in which I there speak of myself and others. So long as J. D. could hope that the Beaver items would be creditable to the importer or his friends he could forbear; but no sooner does their tyrannical enforcement on the Benson Church cause 66 of the members to withdraw, than his anger is kindled, and laying hold of my note as the ostensible cause of his unchristianlike, and ungentlemanly attack, his letter of the 10th Feb. appears; where, instead of evidence he gives assertion, and invective instead of argument.

In the 1st paragraph of that letter, he says, the representation that he had agreed to visit the Church on South Benson for a "special purpose," is "false;" and towards the close, he states that his "name, (with others) had been wantonly presented to the public in connection with suggestions which" he pronounced "false and slanderous." Why J. D. did not state to the public what I had represented that "special purpose" to be, or what those slanderous suggestions were, his own conscience, and the number who witnessed his untiring efforts at two succeeding meetings to effect that very purpose, will return a sufficient answer. And as he did not fulfil *his promise* to be there in November, his conduct at the subsequent meetings proves the suggestions to be true.

In relation to nursing the church on Benson, one fact speaks sufficiently plain. If Dr. Noel did not feel conscious that it would be hazardous to deny the plain statement in the Examiner, why did he, when he thought proper to take that paper into the pulpit at Benson to effect the same holy purpose which has since brought J. Dudley before the public, represent me as saying that *he* had nursed that church more than any other *man* had nursed it? Thus making the contrast between himself and others, instead of between that church and other churches. What his motives were for this perversion, the public will judge. Mr. Dudley says it is a partial and false statement that "an animated discussion took place on the sufficiency of the Scriptures." The subjoined certificate meets this, and the testimony of hundreds who witnessed it could be brought to sustain the truth of it.

According to J. Dudley, I "questioned the right of the church to maintain her own views, that is, her own creed;" and "*sedulously* concealed my views of the union." Each of these statements I deny; and, with reference to the first, I refer to the 7th item itself, as it now stands on the Franklin Minutes, to show, that, not the rights of any church, but "*the alone sufficiency of the Scriptures*" is the subject on which it treats. To the votes of the church, at her November and December meetings I appeal to show that that was the subject before them at the time referred to; and to the fact, that when interrupted by others I was sustained by the Moderator, as evidence that I did not wander from this into any so irrelevant a subject as the rights of the church at Benson on this or any other topic. The following extract, which was the basis of my address on

that occasion, will show what my object was; as well as evince whether *then* or *now* I would sedulously conceal my views. "The principle I propose to defend is this: That the Scripture, in its own words, sentences and connection, forms the *only* and all sufficient rule for the faith and practice of every disciple and church of *Christ*; and that this book, so often referred to by Bro: Waller, the Philadelphia Confession of Faith (though every word in it were true), or any other human arrangement whatever, even of truth, cannot occupy its place in the church of *Christ*."

But, says J. Dudley, "out of the forty not ten, no perhaps not one are opposed to a creed," this is fully disproved by the following document, and though the anti-creed brethren did agree to remain in the church, the creed notwithstanding, provided the record "*already made*, deciding the 7th item a corruption, was erased, yet, that it was a step to which they were urged by no love for creeds, but by a love of peace, and to avoid the necessity of a division, the proposition itself clearly shows.

He speaks of a "lad of my grade" doing certain things, and least he should not be understood by the "people," whom he seems anxious to benefit by his wisdom on the *very* difficult term "Creed;" he emphasises his advice to me, as a "*Tailor* to stick to my goose." It is not now to be decided whether the demagogue in politics, the bigot in religion, the speculator on the necessities of his fellow citizens, or the Mechanic, who fulfils the great law of his Creator, that "in the sweat of his face he should eat his bread," is the most valuable citizen, or reputable character; and however it might be decided, I avow myself of the latter class. That until I was twenty-one years of age duty required unremitting attention to business, and that what little education I possess, I have had principally to acquire since then, I state with thankfulness for a success I could not have anticipated, but with no blush for my previous employment.

Unaided by family influence, and obliged to rely mainly on my own exertions, some difficulties, it is true, have laid in my path; these however there was a pleasure in overcoming, for my object was, is, and I trust ever will be, to benefit my fellow men at least as much as myself. Cheering indeed have been the attachments of a circle of friends, which the kindness of Heaven has raised around me, when contrasted with the conduct of J. Dudley and certain others, who commenced their crusade against me three or four years ago on the church floor in Frankfort, when they were withstood by the venerable Elder Taylor, and who have never since allowed any opportunity to escape them, where they conceived there was a prospect of destroying one who refused to recognize *any* "grades" but those of virtue and vice. Whatever J. Dudley may suppose my "grade" to be, is a matter of the least conceivable moment with me, so long as he rests assured that here all notice, by me, of any thing proceeding from his pen on this subject will cease. Asking pardon of the brethren and public for bestowing so lengthily a notice on Mr. Dudley's effusion, I would point my companions in the cause of Truth to the words of the Master: "Happy shall you be

when men shall revile and persecute you, and, on my account, accuse you falsely of every evil thing! Rejoice and exult, for great is your reward in Heaven."

JOSEPHUS HEWETT.

Mercer County, April 3, 1830.

CERTIFICATE.

Being called on by Josephus Hewett to state what we know in relation to some statements he has made in the Christian Examiner, to which J. Dudley has taken exceptions, we think it sufficient to say, we are certain that the neighborhood impression justified his making each of those statements. With regard to what brother Hewett said concerning the "animated discussion," so far from its being partial or false, we affirm it to be true, and do believe it to be capable of proof by every impartial spectator of the proceedings of that day. We would further say, that if there is in our church a single member who is in favor of a human creed, we know it not, nor do we believe it.

As to what J. Dudley says concerning brother Hewett's intruding himself upon the South Benson church, we would say, that more than one messenger was sent between forty and fifty miles to solicit his attendance on that occasion; and at all times while in our neighborhood, so far from his course being factious or schismatic, he continually urged us to avoid every thing tending to a rent, to which, however, we have since been driven, as the least evil to which we could subject ourselves.

[Signed]

Benjamin Lowen, E. G. Watkins, R. C. Casey, Lewis Brezendine, John Brown, Mary Hunter, James Hunter, (not a member, a Methodist, and one that did attend,) J. Scofield, Daniel Brown, William Hall, (not a professor,) Shelar Bailey, George Butler.

To the Brethren and Churches composing the Long Run Association, and whosoever it may concern.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I have waited some time, in the expectation that one more competent than myself would address you on a subject of vast importance to ourselves, as well as to the rising generation. But finding that no one has stepped forward, I feel it my duty, disagreeable as it may be, to lay before you an account of some of the occurrences that took place at our last Association.

At that time, two churches petitioned for union and communion with us, and notwithstanding they were composed, generally, of members that had belonged to churches in our Association, in full fellowship with us, and who had never departed from the faith once delivered to the saints, their petitions were *rejected!* The ground of objection was this: It had been reported that these churches were determined to obey Christ and his Apostles, had taken the Scriptures as their only guide in religion, and had accordingly appointed from among themselves, Elders and Deacons,

without the authority or assistance of a Pope or Cardinal, and also met every Lord's day to worship God, after the manner of the primitive saints—in breaking bread and in prayers.

They were called upon to produce their Creed or Confession of Faith; they answered, they had none other than the Old and New Testaments; but for the sake of peace, one of them consented to come under the restrictions of the General Union among the Baptists of this State. In addition to this, there were two brethren in the ministry, members of the Association, who bore testimony that they were present and witnessed the organization of these churches, and that they considered them in order, according to the gospel:—*Yet they were rejected!* because three members of the Association would not submit to a majority consisting of near one hundred. I ask, is there any thing in the New Testament to justify such conduct? No; it is every where condemned by the word of God. "If any seem to be contentious, let them know, we have no such custom, neither the churches." I prefer this charge against brothers George Waller, Stogden and Smith (as being contentious); but to do the two latter justice, I think they would have given up, had it not been for brother George. He, therefore, is chargeable with the whole, let the cost be what it may. To say the least, the two churches were suspended from further trial for twelve months, during which time an Inquisition, under the name of a "committee," are to labour with them. For what? Not that they should obey Jesus and his Apostles: for they professed that it was their meat and their drink to obey the will of their Heavenly Father. What, then? That more than one hundred brethren should bow to His Excellency George the Last and his two Cardinals, and subscribe to the Philadelphia Confession of Opinions, or something like it; so that this one man may govern a thousand. I do not wish to detract from those members of the committee who agreed to go for peace; but I do say, and contend, that those who want to further the views of brother George, in riveting chains of bondage on the necks of the brethren, are guilty. I say *guilty*, because there is crime in compelling any man to submit to be governed by another's *opinions*, and to say the best of human creeds, they are the offspring of a base conspiracy against the citizens of Christ's kingdom, who are free born, and are in bondage to no man: and this has been made as plain to every reflecting and unprejudiced mind, as that the sun is in the Heavens at noon-day.

Much has been said since the Apostacy of the Romish Church, about the Rights and Privileges of Christians. The Baptists have ever opposed all Popery *in name*; but I fear they have been seduced into the *practice* of it; for where one, two, or three men are allowed to govern and thwart the wishes of a hundred, and that in direct violation of the counsels of Heaven, it is the very essence of Popery. For the grand design of the Pope is to govern the whole world, by bringing it into bondage under his creed. What then, is to be done? The creed of the Long Run Association says, that no church shall be admitted into its communion but by an unanimous vote; but, I ask, does Jesus or the Apostles, say so, or do

they say one word about such things? If they do, point me to the chapter and verse, and I will confess my sin. If you cannot do this, then let us meet in brotherly love, and consign our sandy foundation to the moles and the bats, and unite on Jesus and the Apostles, a foundation that will endure, steadfast and immovable, while time endures, instead of building upon a human creed; and when we meet, let it be for the worship of God, and the cultivation of Christian affection; to unite in singing the praises of our Redeemer, and in teaching the people his gospel; instead of legislating our pious brethren out of communion with us. Then will the glory of Zion appear and cover the whole earth, and men shall see her beauty, and come in and fall down and worship, saying, "God is with us of a truth."

Christianity, in its simplicity, is so beautiful and convincing, that all the contentious wicked men and devils in the world, will never be able to prevail, and they had as well try to convert the ocean into dry land as to fight against God; for he will overturn and overturn till his people are delivered, and Babylon as a great stone shall be cast into the sea, to rise no more, and her votaries shall howl; yea, their sound has already gone out, and they cry Heresy! Heresy!! against all who will not pay homage to our *divine call*, and pay us the mammon of unrighteousness for our interpretations!!!! Dear brethren, every spirit of the big *I* and little *u* belongs to the Mother of Harlots; then let it go to its own place, and let us as faithful children of our Heavenly Father, humble ourselves under his mighty hand, and live in love to him and one another, holding fast the faithful word, just as it has been delivered by Christ and the Apostles, and call no man upon earth Rabbi, praying always for all men. And may the God of peace and love, and the union and communion of the Holy Spirit, be with us all; and may we so conduct ourselves in this world, as to be counted worthy of eternal life in the world to come. Amen.

Respectfully, your brother in Christ,

J. BLEDSOE.

THE BAPTIST CHRONICLE.

The *editor* of the Chronicle has "*publicly and formally*" notified us that he edits his own paper, and that he alone is responsible for his own acts and doings. These are things worthy of record. We are glad to hear that he has abandoned the convenient way of foisting himself into notice and favor, by riding on other men's shoulders, for the Chronicle will now rest upon its own merits, and not upon the *names* of persons who have no more connection with it (if we may believe Mr. C.) than we have.

It will be recollected that Mr. Chambers proposed to meet the advocates of reformation "in the open plains of honourable warfare." It never once entered into our minds that he was only *jesting*; and accordingly, in our last paper, we submitted a series of questions for discussion, involving all the real points of difference between the Baptists in this state. Mr. C. had thrown down the gauntlet—we accepted the challenge, and entered the lists in ex-

pectation of finding him there, armed *cap a pie*, and ready at all points to do battle bravely, if not for christianity, at least for the faith once delivered by his favorite *Saint*—"Augustin, the famous bishop of Hippo." But it appears that he was either jesting when he gave the challenge, or we were egregiously mistaken in our calculations of his capability and courage. After waiting sometime, instead of appearing personally, he sent us the following note:

"The editors of the Examiner, have done us some honour in devoting so much of their last number for our benefit; and we are sorry that we have not time or room to return the compliment. Having much to attend to, and as we conceive of higher importance, we refer them, for further particulars, to our correspondent, "A Baptist," whose first communication appears in this number of the Chronicle, page 50, dated at Lexington. He seems as a writer, to be both able and willing to attend to them."

This polite and friendly epistle was accompanied by "A Baptist" (the substitute of Mr. C.) bearing on his shield the elegant and classical motto, "*Give the d—l his due*," and who answers our interrogatories in the most *luminous, argumentative, and christian* manner, as you will perceive. The gentleman is here—he shall speak for himself.

FROM THE BAPTIST CHRONICLE.

Brother Chambers—I rejoice that there is yet one paper in the state of Kentucky, that is willing and able to sustain the cause of the Baptists. New periodicals are starting up almost every where, which promulgate monthly, the most vituperous slanders, and if they keep on in the same ratio for another year, they will be as plenty as the frogs of Egypt. We have one in our town which you no doubt have seen, called the *Christian Examiner*, and Edited by Joseph G. Norwood; and as you will no doubt come in contact with him, (as he is one who has been badly bitten with the rabid animal, now running through our country, called "Reform"—it should be "deform,") it is necessary that you, and the public, should be put in possession of all the circumstances connected with the starting of that paper, and in giving them I hope to remember, at least, the vulgar adage, to "give the D—l his due."

Mr. Norwood is a young man of considerable talents, which he has improved by close reading, and as a man I respect him. He became a member of the Presbyterian Church, in this town, during the first revivals, and was, for a length of time, an orderly member of that church; but in the course of his investigations, he became convinced that infant sprinkling was a human tradition, and that immersion was the only baptism, the one spoken of by Paul; and accordingly concluded to be immersed. This he did not so immediately, but deferred it till Jacob Creath, the younger, should return from a journey. In the mean time, he got hold of the *Christian Baptist*, and in his heat to get out of the Pado church, he swallowed all that Campbell said about water regeneration, without choking; and when Jacob came, he told him he was right; that his sins had not been forgiven before, notwithstanding he had been an orderly member of the Presbyterian Church for some time, and

that he must go down into the water to wash away his sins. He did so; was immersed for the remission of his sins, and was told that he was now a Christian. But I can hardly consider him one, as he was only baptized in the name of Jesus, and not in the name of the Holy Trinity. He drank deep of the Christian Baptist, and the other writings of the Brooke County Reformer, and at last came out a confirmed disciple of this modern Alexander; declared that all the churches were in Babylon, and that there was only wanting a Zerubbabel and a Nehemiah to lead them to Jerusalem. The one he found in Campbell, and looked for the other in Fish-back. But he would not suit, and Mr. Norwood could not stand open communion, and he concluded to transform *himself* into a leader. He accordingly commenced reading the Bible according to his creed, and at last we behold this young Campbell hatching the mighty idea of a periodical. He issued proposals and commenced printing almost simultaneously. His maiden effort appears, and in it an attack on the Elkhorn Association, and an outrage on all the other papers in the West, in order to give a tone to his paper. It took finely among all the Baptists of loose principles; and this new Alexander had the pleasure of writing some hundred names on his list; and pocketed the money. The people (I mean his followers) had become disgusted with Campbell, and as Norwood wrote in a more temperate spirit, they even in some places extolled it higher than the Christian Baptist. The principles he advocated were the same as Campbell's, and were written in a more insinuating manner, as he whipped the ——— round the stump and did not speak plain.

We feared that it would do much harm; but *my* fears increased when Jacob Creath commenced his essays, although we were morally certain of one thing; that he would change the somewhat decent character of the paper, and make it a vehicle of abuse; for I have never yet seen a piece of his writing that was not filled with low and vulgar epithets, and traductions of other men's character. (Witness his creed essays.) The character of the paper *has* changed, and has become a sink of abuse, slander, falsehood, and, I had almost said, infidelity. I do not charge Norwood with bringing this about, but it has been done by the other main-spring, Creath, with whom he has become infatuated. And I might say, that I believe Norwood would be a firm and a most able defender of Baptist principles, as taught by our old and faithful ambassadors who stood the brunt of persecution in Virginia and New England, if he could be weaned from Campbellism. And I exhort him, as he loves his soul, to heed what he is about; to examine what he is doing; and not to be deluded by his own sophistry and the sophistry of other men. I heard to-day that Jacob Creath, Jr. was to become an editor of the paper with Norwood. If he does there is not much to fear; for he will kill it in a year with his sophisms about what he is pleased to call human creeds. Your last number sets that subject at rest, and the public mind is completely satisfied. I think the position unassailable, and the remarks unanswerable.

I hope that you will go on in the able manner in which you have

commenced to unfold the system of the New Light Baptists, Campbell, Norwood, Creath & Co., and expose the rottenness concealed under their specious garb of sanctity, put on by nature. Your 2d number I highly approve, and hope you will always display the same ability.

A BAPTIST.

So ends this valiant champion—Mr. Chambers's proxy; and for fear our readers should forget it, we will again repeat that the above is Mr. C's, able and *conclusive reply* to the interrogatories in our last. When we responded to Mr. C's call, we chose such weapons as are lawful to be used in our Sovereign's kingdom, viz. Scriptural Testimony and Brotherly Kindness. We expected Mr. C. to meet us in the same condition; but instead of that he sends a *mask*, mailed in billingsgate and slander from head to foot. We confess that we are unequal to a contest of this character, and yield without a struggle. We would, however, just say, before taking leave, that although Mr. Chambers does not feel himself competent to examine our principles nor to overturn our positions, we are yet willing to meet any of his "contributors" on the points named in our 5th No., provided they will refrain from abuse, use such arguments as are based on the Scriptures, and write over their proper signatures. If they wish to have the field entirely to themselves, they will continue to wear masks, deal in defamation, and offer assertion instead of proof; they will then escape without notice.

We would also let Mr. C. into the secret, that personal invective and slander never yet proved or disproved the truth of a proposition; never proved the truth of the Bible, nor the falsehood of the Koran. If such were the case, Christianity would, long before this time, have been *proved* out of existence, for its opponents in all ages have heaped mountains of abuse upon it, while its advocates could only sustain it by the unfashionable weapons of evidence, legitimate logical argument, and a godly walk and conversation. Yet, as puny as these weapons may appear in the sight of Mr. C., Christianity is still the rock of ages; and so long as that endures, so long will our principles endure, unless he overturns them by showing that they are contrary to *reason* and *revelation*. We invite him to this task.

EDITORS.

THE TERMS OF GENERAL UNION.

At present there is almost as great a hue and cry among the old Arminian and Fullerite Baptists, with their different coloured Calvinistic gowns on, about the terms of general union, as there was among the Ephesians about the little silver shrine which they supposed had come down from Jupiter, the great god of the Greeks and Romans. We are sometimes asked, if we will subscribe to them? what do we think of them? We know that we speak the language of the anti-creed party among the baptists, when we say, that as terms of union and correspondence, between the different associations of Baptists, we have no objection to them; while, at the same time, we *protest* against having the piety or orthodoxy of any individual, or church, *tested* by any other rule than the scrip-

tures of the Old and New Testament, which is sound doctrine, according to all the creeds that we ever saw.

Notwithstanding all the proscription and persecution, which have been exercised against the anti-creed party, they have never *violated* one item of this much celebrated stipulation, among the regular and separate Baptists, and if the power was not on the side of the "vantage ground," they could sue and recover damages, for injuries sustained. We claim to be in the general union, and shall until the contrary is proved. The great bone of contention at this time in Kentucky, with the Calvinists, is the operation of the spirit "before faith in order to produce faith." They ride this hobby in order to save the clerical saddle, and crown, but the real and true cause is the rejection of creeds, and with them, clerical power, and rabbinism. Creeds are of no more use to the common people, than a fifth wheel is to a waggon. They had no part nor lot in their formation, they never use them, and many never saw them. We will now insert those articles that the public may judge whether we have violated them in any way.

Art. 1. That the scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the infallible word of God, and the **ONLY** rule of faith and practice.

2. That there is but one only true God, and in the Godhead or divine essence, there are Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

3. That by nature we are fallen and depraved creatures.

4. That salvation, regeneration, sanctification, and justification, are by the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ.

5. That the saints will persevere finally through grace to glory.

6. That believers baptism, by immersion, is necessary to the receiving of the Lord's supper.

7. That the salvation of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked will be eternal.

8. That it is our duty to be tender and affectionate to each other, and to study the happiness of the children of God in general, and to be engaged singly to promote the honour of God.

9. And that preaching "Christ tasted death for every man," shall be no bar to communion.

We again say that we have not violated one item of this stipulation. The first article is against creeds—they contain fallible "words"—the words of the Holy Spirit are infallible. We say with these men, that the Scriptures are the "**only** rule of faith and practice." This forever and to all intents and purposes excludes all human creeds, and fallible confessions of opinions. Are our brethren treating us tenderly and affectionately, when they proscribe us from their meeting houses, appoint life guards for the creeds and the clergy, call us disorganizers, restorationists, infidels, illuminati, &c. &c.?

EDITORS.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH BY WILLIAM JONES.

Ephraim A. Smith, of Danville, Ky. has issued proposals for publishing by subscription a new edition of this work. It is appropriately styled a history of the *Christian church*, and exhibits

therise and progress of Christianity from the birth of Christ to the eighteenth century. Although the author marks in his journey the desolating inroads of that man of sin spoken of by the Apostle, yet he never loses sight of the main object of his work, but accompanies the meek and lowly followers of the Lamb whithersoever they went, from the mount in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, to the vallies of Piedmont, when Antichrist had exalted himself and covered the earth with lying wickedness. The author makes no pretensions to originality, but confesses that his object is to render accessible to common readers information which is scattered through a great number of voluminous productions, accessible only to a favoured few. For ourselves, we consider it one of the most desirable and valuable works in existence, to all who are interested in the knowledge of the advancement of Messiah's kingdom, and have no hesitation in saying that it would do the cause of Christ essential service in the hands of any man.

As it regards the publisher, brother Smith, we have been intimately acquainted with him from our childhood, and can say, that we do not know a more pious, upright and intelligent christian in the range of our acquaintance. We recommend him to the fellowship and attention of the brethren with whom he may meet in his journey; the more especially, as his object is not personal emolument, but the advancement of his Master's cause.

For terms &c. see the cover of this No.

J. G. N.

THE BUDGET.

As it is our intention to embody in the Examiner such matter and information as shall be of *real advantage*, not only to the present generation, but also the rising one, we shall hereafter avoid filling our pages with refutations of the numerous *petty slanders* which are circulated against us by the enemies of the Ancient order of things, and confine ourselves strictly to the propositions in our prospectus. We shall, however, issue *quarterly*, for the benefit of our friends and the information of the public, a sheet containing a list of all such productions, with a refutation thereof;—also, notices of the most distinguished of our opponents, together with an expose of their principles, practice, and designs, as they may develop themselves. It will be styled "*The Budget*," and furnished to our subscribers *gratis*. It will be edited by *Jacob Creath Jr.*

EDITORS.

NOTICE.

There will be a three days meeting held by our brethren, at Mays Lick in Mason county, Ky. commencing on the Friday before the fifth Lord's day in May. All the brethren friendly to the Ancient Gospel, and especially the Teachers, are earnestly solicited to attend that meeting. It is expected that the following teachers will attend—John Smith, Jacob Creath Sr., Josiah Collins, William Morton, George G. Boon, J. Creath jr., Josephus Hewett, and G. Gates.

A RECEIPT FOR CREED MAKING.

Dean Swift, in a pointed satire, ridicules the custom of forming doctrines out of detached sentences. The book is not at hand, but the substance is this. A father makes a will, and leaves an estate to his three sons on condition they never dressed like people of fashion. Unhappily shoulder knots came into fashion after the decease of the testator, and one of the sons ingeniously invented a method of explaining the will so as to dress in the fashion, and yet continue in the enjoyment of the estate. He could not find an exception in the will in favour of shoulder knots, he could not even find the word there; however, he observed by dint of study in one word an S, in another an H, in a third an O, and all the rest except a K, in some word or other. He put all these together, and proved to a demonstration that the K did not affect the sound, that shoulder knots were in the will, and consequently that the testator intended an exception in favour of this very innocent and popular fashion.

By this method the Trinitarian and the Socinian, the Arminian, and the Calvinist, the patriarch of Constantinople, the pontiff of Rome, and the Scotch Seceder, may each produce his own system: and with equal ease the history of the American war may be extracted from Homer's Iliad. This method is extremely facilitated by spiritualizing writings. Who is so blind as not to see the silver headed Doctor Franklin in the Greek bard's priest of Apollo, liberty in his daughter, the atlantick in the sea that lashed the beach, and murmured and echoed to his prayers; the parliament of Britain in the councils of the Greeks, and the issue of the contest in the purpose of Jove?—*Robinson's Hist. Baptism.*

Extract of a letter to one of the Editors, dated Natches, March 22.

YESTERDAY, at half past 2 o'clock, P. M. our venerable friend, DOCTOR COOPER, breathed his last, after an illness of two weeks. He was taken ill on his return from his monthly visit to Salem in Jefferson county, and his disease, which was originally the piles, quickly assumed an inflammatory character, which terminated in mortification. He died without a struggle, and not a murmur escaped him. For several days he was sensible of his approaching dissolution, and expressed the most perfect resignation to the will of God. He called upon all about him to repent, to pray, to fly from the wrath to come. He wished only for two hours of renovated strength, that he might call upon all mankind in the language of the GRAVE. A few hours before his death, he called the family together and requested me to read the third chapter of Matthew's Gospel. He then prayed with more fluency, and with more feeling than I had ever seen him evince, and with a pathos which drew tears from every one present. It is remarkable that just before this incident he had been delirious, and become so again directly after he had concluded his prayer. After this he took leave of us all, and ceased to speak; but was evidently engaged in prayer. He shortly afterwards fell into a kind of lethargy, and in about two hours expired without a struggle.

R. J.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in Woodford county, on the 24th of February, Mrs. NANCY SULLIVAN, the consort of Deacon Lewis Sullivan, in the fifty-second year of her age. She was confined to her bed and was greatly afflicted for several months before her departure: she bore her pains and dissolution of body, with christian fortitude and resignation. She retained her reason to the last, and seemed to be sensible of her end, and anxious to be with Jesus, which she manifested by saying in her dying moments, "come Lord Jesus, come quickly." As a christian she was exemplary and devout—as a mother she was tender and watchful—and as a wife she was provident and affectionate. She was a member of the Baptist church, at Clear Creek, and has left a husband and a large family of children to feel and lament her loss. C.

MONTHLY RECEIPTS FOR VOL. 1.

E. P. Gaines, Lawrenceburgh.—E. C. Hickman paid for David J. Caldwell, Danville.—Mrs. Caroline L. Pittman, Dardenne Bridge, Mo.—J. Creath Jr. paid for John Mitchum, Versailles; Peter Higbee, Jessamine Co.; David Warford, Mount Pleasant, Ind.; and also for E. H. Herndon; for Wm. Evans, Somerset, Samuel Miles, Versailles; Samuel Naylor, Frankfort, Ky.; and Silas Reddish, Palmyra, Mo.—Col. W. Johnson, Great Crossing.—Dr. J. C. Cross; John McClane; and Micajah Stone, Fayette Co.—D. W. Parrish, Clark Co.—Elder James Challen, Cincinnati, Ohio.—Bishop A. Campbell paid \$2, Bethany, Va.—John Mason, Mountsterling.—E. A. Smith paid for W. H. Strong, Danville.—James Headley Sen., Fayette Co.—William T. Bryan, Jessamine Co.—Samuel Harris paid for Dudley Tribble, Thomas Richardson, and Mrs. Nancy Harris, Madison Co.—Samuel Coleman.—Dr. L. Warfield paid for Wm. P. Payne, and Elijah Elliott, Paris; and also for Elder A. Eastin, Millersburgh, Ky.—T. Faulconer paid for John Chevis, Colbyville.—Dr. G. W. Nuckols, paid for Mrs. Agnes Wallace, Maj. J. S. Whitaker, and for himself, Shelbyville, K.—E. C. Hickman paid for Mrs. Betsy Hickman, Paris.—G. W. Jeffries paid for Paulina Kellar, Alfred Gosney, Henry Lawel, Nancy Blakely, and John Snyder, Brownsborough, K.—Joseph Craig.—Henry Darnall, Mount Sterling.

Judge *Thomas M. Hickey* has been elected chairman of the board of trustees of Transylvania University, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of John Bradford Esqr. And the Rev. *Jacob Creath jr.* has been elected a trustee of the same institution in the place of Henry Clay Esqr. resigned.—*Reporter.*

ERRATUM.—In this number, page 144, 24th line from bottom, for *vebatim* read *verbatim*.

PUBLISHED BY J. G. NORWOOD, LEXINGTON, KEN.

Price—One Dollar a year, in advance.



PROPOSALS,

By E. A. Smith, of Danville, Ky. for publishing by subscription
*"The History of the Christian Church, from the Birth of Christ to
 the Eighteenth Century, by William Jones."*

"THE value of a work should always be estimated by its usefulness," consequently, the high reputation which this work has obtained among those who have been favoured with its perusal, renders eulogy from me unnecessary. I shall content myself with exhibiting some of the *testimonies to its high character for correctness and usefulness*, from eminent individuals in Europe and the United States, together with a synopsis of its contents.

SYNOPSIS.

Chapter I. A view of the rise and progress of Christianity from the birth of Christ to the end of the first century.—*Chapter II.* History of the Christian Church from the end of the first century to the establishment of Christianity under Constantine the great, A. D. 98—306.—*Chapter III.* The state of Christianity from the accession of Constantine to the rise of the Waldenses. A. D. 306—800. *Chapter IV.* A view of the state of the Christian profession from the beginning of the ninth to the end of the twelfth century. A. D. 800—1200.—*Chapter V.* The history of the Waldenses and Albigenses from the times of Peter Waldo, A. D. 1160, to the days of Wickliffe, A. D. 1360.—*Chapter VI.* History of the Waldenses continued from the middle of the fourteenth to the end of the seventeenth century. A. D. 1350—1700.—*Appendix—Proofs and Illustrations.*

In consequence of the number of friends that have been practised upon the public by persons publishing Books by subscription, I deem it necessary to state that the contemplated edition of Jones' History is not to be published for the purpose of realizing a profit by the sale, but solely with a design to extend the circulation of this valuable Work among those who have not the means to procure the great number of voluminous works from which this is compiled, or leisure to examine them all, if in their possession. In order to effect this object to the greatest extent the Work, containing 676 large 8vo pages, will be delivered to subscribers, well printed on good paper, and in excellent binding, for TWO DOLLARS A COPY. (The same work is sold in this State for five dollars.) ¶ That the public may be assured, respecting the mechanical execution of the work, it is only necessary to state that it will be printed at the "Transylvania Press," Lexington, Kentucky, and will be bound by Mr. Benjamin Keiser of the same place. MARCH, 1830.

Letter from the late WILLIAM STAUGHTON, D. D., President of Columbia College, at Washington.

"I have read with pleasure, *"The History of the CHRISTIAN CHURCH, including an account of the WALDENSES and ALBIGENSES,"* by William Jones.... I consider it a most valuable production, and deserving the attention of all who are desirous of becoming familiar with Ecclesiastical History at one of its most interesting periods. WILLIAM STAUGHTON."

¶ Recommendations from European and American Periodicals, in our next.